REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. A Preliminary Amendment filed on 12/29/2005 amended claims 1-27 and added claims 29-30. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: Claim 29 is addressed to an apparatus; however, no structure is presented in the claim.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 29 is amended to include structure. This overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and claim 29 is allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 30 is directed to computer software. Claim 29 is also rejected because claim 30 is further limiting claim 29 that is directed to an apparatus with no structure.

In response, the applicant respectfully states that Claims 29 and 30 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, and claims 29 and 30 are allowable

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meyerzon et al. (US 6,638,314 B1).

In response, the applicant respectfully states that Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 as not being anticipated by the invention of Meyerzon. The present invention, claimed in Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 provides:

"ways for retrieving or depositing a replica of an electronic document in a computer network. After having selected at least one replica number, a given function is applied. The function requires as input the replica number and a document identifier. The function returns as a result at least one entity identifier, each entity identifier representing an entity in the network that might provide the replica. In a next step, a document related request is addressed to at least one of the identified entities."

Thus, Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 are directed to methods and apparatus for depositing and/or retrieving a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, wherein after a replica number is selected, a given function is applied, where the function uses the replica number and a document identifier. and returns as a result at least one entity identifier.

Whereas, the cited art to Meyerzon, US Patent 6,638,314, filed: June 26, 1998, is entitled: "Method of web crawling utilizing crawl numbers". The Meyerzon abstract reads:

> "A computer based system and method of retrieving information pertaining to electronic documents on a computer network is disclosed. The method includes maintaining a database that associates each electronic document with a corresponding crawl number that indicates the most recent crawl during which a change to the document was detected. During a subsequent crawl, electronic documents that have changed since the previous crawl are retrieved, and selected data is stored in a database. The retrieved document information is marked with a crawl number. During subsequent searches, crawl numbers are used to determine documents that have changed since a specified crawl".

Meyerzon is clearly directed to web crawling utilizing numbers. The numbers are crawl numbers. Meyerzon maintains a database that associates each electronic document with a corresponding crawl number that indicates **the most recent crawl during which a change to the document** was detected [emphasis added]. Meyerzon is not concerned with any replica of an electronic document. Meyerzon is not concerned with depositing and/or retrieving a replica of an electronic document in a computer network. Thus Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 are not anticipated by Meyerzon, and are allowable over Meyerzon.

> *With respect to claim 1, Meyerzon discloses a method for retrieving a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, comprising selecting at least one replica number, (Col. 2, lines 30-34) by applying a given function, requiring the replica number and a document identifier as input: (Col. 3, lines 3-5) determining at least one entity identifier, each entity identifier representing an entity in the network that might provide the replica, (Col. 3, lines 6-8) addressing a document related request to at least one of the identified entities (Col. 2, lines 48-51)*

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the alleged teaching of claim 1 by the art to Meyerzon. claim 1 reads:

> 1. A method for retrieving a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, comprising:
>
> •selecting at least one replica number,
>
> •by applying a given function requiring the replica number and a document identifier as input: determining at least one entity identifier, each entity identifier representing an entity in the network that might provide the replica, and
>
> •addressing a document related request to at least one of the identified entities.

A review of Meyerzon fails to support a teaching and anticipation of claim 1. Meyerzon (Col. 2, lines 30-34) reads:

> Electronic documents that were deleted since the previous Web crawl are detected. Each Web crawl is assigned a unique current crawl number. A crawl number modified is associated with and stored with the storage data from each electronic document retrieved during the Web crawl. The crawl number modified is set equal to the current crawl number when the document is first retrieved, or when it has previously been retrieved and has been found by the mechanism of the invention to have been modified in some substantive manner. In a subsequent search request, a crawl number can be retained as a search parameter and compared against a crawl number modified that is stored with the document data to determine if a document has been modified subsequent to the crawl number specified in the search.

A review of this potion of Meyerzon clearly shows that Meyerzon's crawl number is not a replica number. Meyerzon is not concerned with depositing or retrieving any replica of any document.

A replica of 'something' is by definition a copy of the 'something'. The specification states, the present invention relates to retrieving and/or depositing a replica of an electronic document in a computer network. Claims 1-8, 14-16, and 18-30 are directed to an 'electronic document', and a replica is a copy of the 'electronic document'. Also, on Page 7,

> "With respect to the methods proposed, it is understood that there is no difference in terminology between the original document itself and any replica."

The present specification reads:

> The idea of the claimed approach is that replicas of an electronic document can only be stored at predefined addresses in a computer network. Such addresses are also called entity identifiers in the present context. The addresses are predefined by a function which provides for each replica number per document an address associated to a computing entity where the particular replica can be found or can be stored.

Meyerzon has no concern with entity identifiers in the present context.

The replica number 'n' is a number of the 'n'th replica of the 'electronic document'.

Thus, Meyerzon doesn't teach or anticipate:

> anything about any perlica;
>
> any method for retrieving a replica of an electronic document;
>
> any selection of any replica number;
>
> any application of a given function requiring the replica number and a document identifier as input;
>
> any entity identifier as defined above;
>
> any determining of an entity identifier;
>
> any entity identifier representing an entity in the network that might provide the replica, or
>
> any addressing any document related request to at least one of the identified entities.

Thus, Meyerzon fails to anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 and all claims that depend on claim 1 are allowable.

> *With respect to claim 2, Meyerzon discloses selecting k = N replica numbers, wherein N is a maximum number for replicas, (Col. 2, lines 30-34) by applying the given function k times: determining k entity identifiers (Col. 3, lines 3-5)*

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 30-34 reads:

> Electronic documents that were deleted since the previous Web crawl are detected. Each Web crawl is assigned a unique current crawl number. A crawl number modified is

associated with and stored with the storage data from each electronic document retrieved during the Web crawl.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 3, lines 3-5 reads:

In accordance with still other aspects of this invention, a secure hash function is used to determine a hash value corresponding to each retrieved electronic document copy.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 2, k or N, or to k entity identifiers or any entity identifiers. Thus claim 2 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 3, Meyerzon discloses selecting k replica numbers from a maximum number of N replicas with k c N, (Col. 2, lines 30-42) by applying the given function k times, and determining k entity identifiers (Col. 3, lines 3-5)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 30-42 reads:

Electronic documents that were deleted since the previous Web crawl are detected. Each Web crawl is assigned a unique current crawl number. A crawl number modified is associated with and stored with the storage data from each electronic document retrieved during the Web crawl. The crawl number modified is set equal to the current crawl number when the document is first retrieved, or when it has previously been retrieved and has been found by the mechanism of the invention to have been modified in some substantive manner. In a subsequent search request, a crawl number can be retained as a search parameter and compared against a crawl number modified that is stored with the document data to determine if a document has been modified subsequent to the crawl number specified in the search.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 3, lines 3-5 reads as stated above,

In response, the applicants respectfully states that a review reveals that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 3, k or N, or to k entity identifiers or any entity identifiers. Thus claim 3 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 4, Meyerzon discloses wherein k c= 5 (Col. 2, lines 30-42)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 30-42 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 4, k or N, or to k entity identifiers or any entity identifiers. Thus claim 4 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 5, Meyerzon discloses wherein k = 1 (Col. 2, lines 30-42)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 30-42 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 5, k or any entity identifiers. Thus claim 5 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 6, Meyerzon discloses addressing the document related request to all identified entities (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads:

> Information from each electronic document retrieved during a Web crawl is stored in an index and associated with the corresponding document address specification and with a crawl number modified.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 6, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 6 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 7, Meyerzon discloses addressing the document related request to only selected ones of the identified entities (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 7, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 7 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 8, Meyerzon discloses addressing the document related request only to one entity selected from the identified entities (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 8, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 8 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

> *With respect to claim 14, Meyerzon discloses wherein upon receiving a "replica not available" response from each of the addressed entities, another entity is selected from the identified entities for addressing the document related request to (Col. 14, lines 9-16)*

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 14, lines 9-16 reads:

> The unsuccessful retrieval of a document is detected in the decision block 810. At a step 816 a determination is made of whether the document still exists. If the document no longer exists, at a step 818, entries 410 pertaining to the document are deleted from the history map 308 and the index 210. The entry 510 is then marked as completed in a block 830. An error code 516 can also be inserted into the error code filed 516.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 14, replicas, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 14 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

> *With respect to claim 15, Meyerzon discloses wherein the other entity is selected from the identified entities by choosing an entity with an associated replica number that is lower than the replica number associated to the entity/entities the previous request was addressed to (Col. 14, lines 34-38)*

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 14, lines 34-38 reads:

> At a step 820, the hash value 416 computed the last time the document was retrieved is compared with the new hash value calculated at the step 814 and a determination is made of whether the hash values are equal.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 15, replicas, associated replica, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 15 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 16, Meyerzon discloses Method according to any one of the preceding claims, wherein upon any indication from the addressed entity/entities that neither the replica is not available nor the replica is available there, another entity is selected from the identified entities for addressing the document related request to (Col. 14, lines 9-16)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 14, lines 9-16 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 16, any indication from the addressed entity/entities that neither the replica is not available nor the replica is available there, another entity is selected from the identified entities for addressing the document related request to, or replicas, or entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 16 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 18, Meyerzon discloses selecting from the identified entities at least one most preferred entity, and addressing the document related request to each most preferred entity (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 18, replicas, associated replica, preferred entity, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 18 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 19, Meyerzon discloses wherein each most preferred entity is selected according to said each most preferred entity's distance from the retrieving entity (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 19, replicas, associated replica, preferred entity, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 19 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 20, Meyerzon discloses wherein the distance of an entity is derived from the associated entity identifier (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 20, replicas, associated replica, distance, preferred entity, associated entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 20 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 21, Meyerzon discloses wherein upon receiving a "replica not available" message from the addressed entity, at least one other entity is selected from a set of identified entities as a second best preferred entity for addressing the document related request to, (Col. 14, lines 9-16) this set of identified entities being limited to entities with corresponding replica numbers lower than the replica number that is associated to the most preferred entity identifier (Col. 14, lines 34-38)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 14, lines 9-16 reads as stated above.
The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 14, lines 34-38 reads as stated above.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that there is no relationship in the words in the cited portion to claim 21, replicas, associated replica, preferred entity, entity identifiers or any identified entities. Thus claim 21 is allowable for itself and because it depends on an allowable claim.

With respect to claim 22, Meyerzon discloses wherein the second preferred entity is selected from the set of identified entities according to its distance from the retrieving entity, wherein the closest distance is derived from the associated entity identifier (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 23, Meyerzon discloses a computer program element comprising computer program code means which, when loaded in a processor unit of a computing entity, configures the processor unit to perform a method as claimed in any one of the preceding claims (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads:

Web crawler programs execute on a computer, preferably a general purpose personal computer. FIG. 1 and the following discussion are intended to provide a brief, general

description of a suitable computing environment in which the invention may be implemented. Although not required, the invention will be described in the general context of computer-executable instructions, such as program modules, being executed by a personal computer.

With respect to claim 24, Meyerzon discloses a computing entity for retrieving a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, comprising a control unit designed to perform a method (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 25, Meyerzon discloses a method for depositing a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, selecting a replica number, (Col. 2, lines 30-34) by applying a given function, requiring the replica number and a document identifier as input: (Col. 3, lines 3-5) determining an entity identifier, the entity identifier representing an entity in the network, (Col. 3, lines 6-8) addressing the identified entity for replica depositing purposes (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 3, lines 6-8 reads:

The hash value is stored in the index and used in subsequent Web crawls to determine whether the corresponding electronic document is modified. The current electronic document is retrieved and used to obtain a new hash value, which is compared with the previously determined hash value corresponding to the associated document address specification that is stored in a history map.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 26, Meyerzon discloses a computer program element comprising computer program code means which, when loaded in a processor unit of a computing entity, configures the processor unit to perform a method (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 27, Meyerzon discloses a computing entity for depositing a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, comprising a control unit designed to perform a method (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 28, Meyerzon discloses an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing retrieval of a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 29, Meyerzon discloses an apparatus to retrieve a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, comprising selecting at least one replica number, (Col. 2, lines 30-34) by applying a given function employing the replica number and a document identifier as input, (Col. 3, lines 3-5) determining at least one entity identifier, each entity identifier representing an entity in the network that might provide the replica, (Col. 3, lines 6-8) addressing a document related request to at least one of the identified entities (Col. 2, lines 48-51)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 30-34 reads as stated above.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 3, lines 3-5 reads as stated above.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 3, lines 6-8 reads as stated above.

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 2, lines 48-51 reads as stated above.

With respect to claim 30, Meyerzon discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing retrieval of a replica of an electronic document in a computer network, the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 29 (Col. 6, lines 3-10)

The cited Meyerzon portion Col. 6, lines 3-10 reads as stated above

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 9-13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (US 6,638,314 B1), in view of Imaichi et al. (US 7,277,881 B2)

The further cited art to Imaichi, US Patent 7,277,881, filed: August 31, 2001, is entitled: "Document retrieval system and search server".

The abstract reads: "Ordering is properly performed for document databases registered in an associative search server. In an associative search server capable of performing an associative search by correlating a plurality of document databases, the history of the associative search is stored as an associative search recording table by associative search recording table storing means. By using this associative search recording table, a showing order of document databases presented by document database selecting means is properly set by showing order changing means. Alternatively, by registration fee calculating means, calculation is properly carried out as to registration fees of the document database registered in the associative search server".

With respect to claim 9, Meyerzon does not disclose calculating a cost function for each of the k entities, the cost function providing a cost value as result which indicates a cost to address the relevant entity.
However, Imaichi discloses calculating a cost function for each of the k entities, the cost function providing a cost value as result which indicates a cost to address the relevant entity (Col. 2, lines 53-59) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi to calculate a cost function relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads:

In addition, when a registration fee or a commission of a document database is calculated, by using the number of times of being used as an association origin and the number of

times of being used as an association target recorded in the associative search recording table, it is possible to calculate a registration fee or a commission more properly and specifically than a conventional method

With respect to claim 10, Meyerzon does not disclose further comprising calculating a cost function for each of the k entities, the cost function providing a cost value as result which indicates a cost to address the relevant entity, wherein each entity to be addressed is selected from the identified entities due to an associated cost value.

However, Imaichi discloses calculating a cost function for each of the k entities, the cost function providing a cost value as result which indicates a cost to address the relevant entity, wherein each entity to be addressed is selected from the identified entities due to an associated cost value (Col. 2, lines 53-59)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi to select a cost value relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads as stated above,

With respect to claim 11, Meyerzon does not disclose wherein addressed consist of at least one entity showing a lowest cost value/s. However, Imaichi discloses wherein addressed consist of at least one entity showing a lowest cost values (Col. 2, lines 53-59)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi to select a cost value relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads as stated above,

With respect to claim 12, Meyerzon does not disclose wherein cost values for the addressed entities are derived from communication with these entities. However, Imaichi discloses cost values for the addressed entities are derived from communication with these entities (Col. 2, lines 53-59)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi

to select a cost value relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads as stated above,

With respect to claim 13, Meyerzon does not disclose wherein cost values for the addressed entities are derived from a cost database.

However, Imaichi discloses cost values for the addressed entities are derived from a cost database (Col. 2, lines 53-59) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi to select a cost value relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads as stated above,

With respect to claim 17, Meyerzon does not disclose wherein the other entity is selected due to an associated cost value. However, Imaichi discloses wherein the other entity is selected due to an associated cost value (Col. 2, lines 53-59)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyerzon with the teachings of Imaichi to select a cost value relevant to the entities, in order to associate a fee with a given retrieved entity.

The cited Imaichi portion Col. 2, lines 53-59 reads as stated above,

The portions copied above for Imaichi, fail to support or fill in the deficiency of Meyerzon. thus, all claims are not anticipated or made obvious by the combined art.

Thus al claims are allowable.

If any questions remain, please contact the undersigned representative before issuing a FINAL action.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____/Louis Herzberg/_____

Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane
Monsey, NY 10952

Customer Number: 54856